

REMARKS

Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for indicating that claims 9-13 and 18-21 are allowable over the art of record.

Claims 9-13 and 18-21 are pending in the application. Claims 9 and 18 are independent. Claims 1-8 and 14-17 have been canceled. These changes are believed to introduce no new matter and their entry is respectfully requested.

Rejection of Claims 1-4, 8, and 14-17 Under 35 U.S.C. §102(e)

In paragraph 2 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-4, 8, and 14-17 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Clark et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,774,696 to Clark et al. (hereinafter "Clark"). A claim is anticipated only if each and every element of the claim is found, either expressly or inherently, in a reference. (MPEP §2131 *citing Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628 (Fed. Cir. 1987)). The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the claim. *Id. citing Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226,1236 (Fed. Cir. 1989)). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Although Applicants believe that claims 1-4, 8, and 14-17 are patentable as written, in the interest of expediting prosecution of the present application, Applicants have canceled claims 1-4, 8, and 14-17, rendering moot the rejection of claims 1-4, 8, and 14-17. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and remove the rejection of claims 1-4, 8, and 14-17.

Rejection of Claims 5-7 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

In paragraph 4 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 5-7 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Clark et al. To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, an Examiner must show three things: (1) that there is some suggestion or motivation to modify a reference or combine reference teachings to arrive at the claimed invention, (2) that there must be a reasonable expectation of success, and (3) that the references teach or suggest each and every element of the claimed invention. (MPEP §2143.) Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Although Applicants believe that claims 5-7 are patentable as written, in the interest of expediting prosecution of the present application, Applicants have canceled claims 5-7, rendering moot the rejection of claims 5-7. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and remove the rejection of claims 5-7.

CONCLUSION

Applicant submits that all grounds for rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot and that the application is now in condition for allowance. The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned representative if the Examiner believes that an interview might be useful for any reason.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY SOKOLOFF TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Date: December 22, 2004 Jan Little - Washington
Reg. No. 41,181

FIRST CLASS CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail with sufficient postage in an envelope addressed to Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

on December 22, 2004
Date of Deposit

Adrian Villarreal

Name of Person Mailing Correspondence

[Signature] December 22, 2004
Signature Date